



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

account of the practical activities of Socii, and follows this with a very clear analysis of the process of socialization and co-operation. The two most suggestive chapters in the book deal with the question of social pleasure and the social nature. The author's fundamental idea that like-mindedness, meaning like-responsiveness to given stimuli, as well as similarity in physical structure of the brain, constitutes the basis of social organization, is brought out very clearly in three forms:

1. Considered as sympathetic like-mindedness, which results in impulsive social action.
2. As formal like-mindedness, out of which tradition and conformity to existing social standards are developed.
3. Rational like-mindedness, in the development of which public opinion becomes a safe and intelligent guide to progress and social values are weighed and become the objects of planned efforts.

Some interesting material on the sociological development of human society is introduced in a form which is perfectly intelligible to the lay reader and to students who are beginners. The concluding sections on Civilization, Progress, and Democracy are suggestive in ways that make them indispensable reading for all to take an intelligent interest in modern problems concerning public life and social duty. The book is, by all odds, the best presentation, in small compass, of a general view of modern sociological theories and tendencies.

S. M. LINDSAY.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

DIVINE IMMANENCE: An Essay on the Spiritual Significance of Matter. By J. R. Illingworth, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. Pp. 212.

In this book Mr. Illingworth continues the line of thought which he followed in his Bampton Lectures on "Personality, Human and Divine." He writes as an apologist for Christianity, and his object is to show that a right view of the relation between spirit and matter leads inevitably to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation as fitly expressing the nature of God and His relation to man and the world. The philosophical basis of Mr. Illingworth's argument is to be found mainly in the first chapter of his book, in which he discusses the relations of matter and spirit. "Spirit," he says (p. 9), "is what thinks and wills and loves; and

matter is what moves in space: and whatever their ultimate relationship may be, we may fairly speak of two things whose modes of manifestation are so different, as for practical purposes two different things. . . . While matter is of use—incessant and inevitable use—to spirit, spirit is of no use to matter. Man can improve material things, of course, from his own point of view, by employing them for purposes of science or of art; but in so doing he only alters their relation to himself; he does not and cannot change their nature.” This is the fundamental position of Mr. Illingworth’s book,—that matter is a thing the nature of which is given, fixed, unchangeable, and that spirit is another thing the nature of which is not so absolutely determined, but which is able to make use of matter for its own alteration, improvement, or “realization.” So far as our experience goes, matter and spirit are inseparable, “inextricably combined” (p. 5), and yet “as self-conscious and self-determined, spirit reigns in a realm apart” (p. 7).

The consequences of such a position as this are sufficiently obvious. Matter is God’s tool and man’s plaything,—God’s tool which He uses when He likes and sets aside when it is in the way; man’s plaything on which he “tries his ‘prentice hand” and sharpens his spiritual skill. Spirit is left with a perplexing freedom to do absolutely what it likes. The nature of matter, after all, really does not count. “There is one department of the world in which demonstrably the reign of law breaks down” (p. 92). That department is the life of man, whose “whole body and soul are involved in one complex, composite disease, due to the violation of the appropriate and natural laws of his species” (p. 93), and accordingly the breach of nature’s laws “is a fact” which “is daily before our eyes” (p. 94). And God intervenes for “the restitution of these laws when, obviously and beyond controversy, broken,—the counteraction of the ‘miracle’ of sin” (*loc. cit.*). In short, the wilful spirit of man does what *it* likes with matter, and then, to redress the balance, God does what *He* likes with matter. It is assumed, of course, that the spirit of God is good and the spirit of man more or less evil; but the presupposition is that the laws of nature are not statements of the actual nature of things, but rules which God has, with empty freedom, laid down, which man can, with as empty freedom, casually break, and which God can re-establish if, how and when, He pleases. If this be granted, then, as in Mr. Illingworth’s book, the orthodox views (in any

form or degree of orthodoxy) of the Incarnation, Miracles, Sacraments, and the Trinity can easily be justified. Indeed, all things are possible. We are "absolutely ignorant of the essential nature of God" (p. 86), and accordingly we must accept our knowledge of Him from Revelation. And as to ourselves, we must trust our religious instincts, our "persistent feelings," as well as our "consistent thoughts" (p. 59), for "there is no possible ground for elevating one element of our personality above another" (p. 61). Thus in two Appendices Mr. Illingworth emphasizes his view by maintaining the absolute self-identity and indeterminate freedom of the formal or abstract self, which he identifies with "the person or self-conscious subject," committing himself to such statements as that, "in proportion as our character determines us, we are not self-determined, we do not act as selves, consciously using our power of choice" (p. 194).

There is no need to enlarge on the unsatisfactory nature of such an argument as this. It goes, not "back to Kant," but "back to Descartes." If matter can be said to be of use to spirit in so far as it renders possible the development or realization of the potentialities of spirit, surely spirit must be said to be of use to matter in so far as it brings forth the possibilities that lie hid in matter. And this means that spirit is not free to do absolutely what it likes with matter, but merely free to act along the lines which the nature and laws of matter determine.

Mr. Illingworth writes excellent and lucid English and his book contains a great deal of interesting matter, especially in the second chapter, in which "the religious influence of the material world" is illustrated by a series of quotations from writers of all ages and lands.

R. LATTA.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

DOCTRINE AND DEVELOPMENT: University Sermons. By Hastings Rashdall, D.C.L., Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. London: Methuen & Co. Pp. xvi., 288.

Mr. Rashdall and Mr. Illingworth have a good deal in common, although they belong to somewhat different schools of Anglican thought,—Mr. Illingworth being a High Churchman of the newer type, while Mr. Rashdall is a Broad Churchman. Mr. Rashdall's sermons do not make up so continuous a whole as Mr. Illingworth's book, and he has given them the title "Doctrine and Development"